

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 9-20 are cancelled. Claims 1-8 and 21-48 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 22-24, 26-28, 30-32, and 37-46 have been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, claims 34-36 and 47-48 were objected to because of informalities and have been amended to correct same.

Turning now to the art rejections, claims 1-2, 5-6, 21-22, 25-26, 29-30, 33-34, and 37-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menez (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0115606) in view Zenoni (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034873) and Sakamoto (Japanese Publication No. JP 09-162821). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Independent claims 1, 5, 21, 25, 29, and 33 have each been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on art. No new matter has been added by these changes. Support for these changes is found at, e.g., Figs. 10-11, 13, and 23 and pages 27-32 and 40-42 of the specification.

As amended herein, claim 1 recites:

a transaction content providing unit that provides transaction content for transmission to the receiver over a second broadcast channel, the transaction content

including a plurality of templates, at least some of the plurality of templates corresponding to various transaction types, the transaction content further including a plurality of replacement information incidental to the plurality of program content[.]

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest transaction content including a plurality of templates. Moreover, neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest templates corresponding to various transaction types (included in transaction content). Further, neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest transaction content further including a plurality of replacement information incidental to the plurality of program content.

Amended claim 1 further calls for:

a trigger content providing unit that provides trigger content that serves as a trigger for reproducing a portion of the transaction content in the receiver, the trigger content including one or more identifiers respectively associated with at least one of one or more of the plurality of templates or one or more of the plurality of replacement information for insertion into the one or more of the plurality of templates[.]

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest trigger content including one or more identifiers respectively associated with one or more of a plurality of templates. Moreover, neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest trigger content including one or more identifiers respectively associated with one or more of a plurality

of replacement information. Further, neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest trigger content including one or more identifiers respectively associated one or more of a plurality of replacement information for insertion into the one or more of a plurality of templates.

Amended claim 1 also calls for:

a combining unit that combines the program content and the trigger content and transmits the combined content over the first broadcast channel so that

“(b) when the trigger content is triggered by a user while the receiver is receiving the program content on the first broadcast channel, the receiver (i) switches from receiving over the first broadcast channel to receiving over the second broadcast channel in response to the triggering of the trigger content, (ii) receives the transaction content provided by the transaction content providing apparatus over the second broadcast channel, (iii) extracts from the received transaction content the one or more templates and the one or more replacement information associated with the identifiers included in the trigger content, and (iv) causes reproduction of at least some of the transaction content based on the extracted templates and the extracted replacement information[.]

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest that when trigger content is triggered by a user while a receiver is receiving program content on a first broadcast channel, the receiver extracts from the received transaction content one or more templates associated with identifiers included in the trigger content. Moreover, neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest when trigger

content is triggered by a user while a receiver is receiving program content on a first broadcast channel, the receiver extracts from the received transaction content one or more replacement information associated with identifiers included in the trigger content. Further, neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest when trigger content is triggered by a user while a receiver is receiving program content on a first broadcast channel, the receiver causes reproduction of at least some of transaction content based on extracted templates. Still further, neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest when trigger content is triggered by a user while a receiver is receiving program content on a first broadcast channel, the receiver causes reproduction of at least some of transaction content based on extracted templates and extracted replacement information.

It follows, for at least these reasons, that neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the system set out in claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of the references.

Independent claims 5, 21, 25, 29, and 33 each call for features similar to those set out in the above excerpts of claim 1 and are therefore each patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of Menez, Zenoni, and Sakamoto at least for the same reasons.

Claims 2 and 37-38 depend from claim 1, claims 6 and 39-40 depend from claim 5, claims 22 and 41-42 depend from

claim 21, claims 26 and 43-44 depend from claim 25, claims 30 and 45-46 depend from claim 29, and claims 34 and 47-48 depend from claim 33. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

Claims 3, 7, 23, 27, 31, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menez in view of Zenoni and Sakamoto and further in view of Cook (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0018966). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1, claim 7 depends from claim 5, claim 23 depends from claim 21, claim 27 from claim 25, claim 31 depends from claim 29, and claim 35 depends from claim 33. Therefore, each of the claims is distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Menez, Zenoni, and Sakamoto for at least the same reasons.

The relied-on sections of Cook do not overcome the deficiencies of the relied-on sections of Menez, Zenoni, and Sakamoto.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's objections and the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: October 14, 2009

Respectfully submitted,  
Electronic signature: /Lawrence  
E. Russ/  
Lawrence E. Russ  
Registration No.: 35,342  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

1058664\_1.PCS